

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 01 OF 10 151138Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
/078 W

-----033795 151154Z /11

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2748
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM NATO MBFR
SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS OF
APRIL 14, 1978

REF: STATE 96686 DTG 142251Z APR 78

IN RESPONSE TO REFTEL, WE ARE TRANSMITTING BELOW THE
FULL TEXT OF THE APRIL 14 INFORMAL SESSION. YOU WILL
NOTE THAT THERE ARE NO OUTSTANDING EASTERN QUESTIONS ON DATA.
IN ADDITION, EASTERN QUESTIONS ON THE INITIATIVE WERE
ANSWERED IN THE COURSE OF THE SESSION. HOWEVER, WE ARE
CONSIDERING AMPLIFYING THE ANSWER TO THE EAST'S QUESTION
CONCERNING THE TIME REQUIRED FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
PHASE I REDUCTIONS BY DRAWING ON MATERIAL USED EARLIER. WE
ARE ALSO FORMULATING TWO QUESTIONS ON EASTERN DATA WHICH ARE
DESIGNED TO CLARIFY CONTRADICTIONS IN EASTERN ANSWERS REGARDING
THE MANNER IN WHICH UNITS OF BRIGADE AND REGIMENTAL SIZE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 01 OF 10 151138Z

DIRECTLY SUBORDINATE TO MODS OF THE GSFG WERE ALLOCATED
BETWEEN MAJOR FORMATIONS AND OTHER, AND TO CLARIFY EASTERN USE
IN SUCH ALLOCATION OF THE TERMS QUOTE UNITS, FORMATIONS, SMALL
UNITS AND SUBUNITS UNQUOTE. BEGIN TEXT:

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE APRIL 14, 1978 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE
VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE BELGIAN,

FRG AND US REPS, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV AND SHUSTOV, GDR REP OESER AND POLISH REP STRULAK. MILITARY ADVISORS WERE ALSO PRESENT.

2. IN THE SESSION, WESTERN REPS ANSWERED QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE EAST IN THE PREVIOUS SESSION ABOUT WESTERN DATA AND ASKED EASTERN REPS FURTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT EASTERN DATA. EASTERN REPS ASKED WELL OVER TWENTY MAJOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE, SUPPLEMENTED BY ACTIVE FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS. WESTERN REPS ANSWERED NEARLY ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS.

3. THE FINAL SESSION OF THE ROUND WILL BE HELD ON APRIL 18.
END SUMMARY

4. BELGIAN REP, AS HOST, GREETED PARTICIPANTS.

5. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, BELGIAN REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE AT THIS POINT TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS WHICH THE EAST HAD ASKED AT THE LAST MEETING WHICH THE WEST HAD NOT ALREADY ANSWERED. EASTERN REPS HAD WANTED TO KNOW WHAT U.S. AIR FORCE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY. THE ANSWER WAS THAT U.S. AIR FORCE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN ALLOCATED TO THE TWO CATEGORIES AS FOLLOWS:

-- ALL PERSONNEL OF ALL UNITS ASSIGNED TO THE U.S. 17TH AIR FORCE WERE INCLUDED IN THE CATEGORY FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS.
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 01 OF 10 151138Z

-- ALL OTHER U.S. AIR FORCE PERSONNEL IN THE AREA, EXCEPT FOR THOSE ASSIGNED TO MULTINATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

6. BELGIAN REP STATED THAT EASTERN REPS HAD ALSO ASKED WHETHER THE PERSONNEL OF UNITS AND FORMATIONS IN THE AREA WHO WERE NOT SUBORDINATED TO THE COMMANDER OF THE U.S. ARMY IN EUROPE HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN WESTERN FIGURES, AND IF SO, IN WHAT CATEGORY? U.S. GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL IN THE AREA IN ALL UNITS NOT SUBORDINATE TO THE COMMANDER OF THE U.S. ARMY IN EUROPE HAD BEEN INCLUDED AND THEY WERE IN THE FIGURES FOR US GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL IN THE SECOND CATEGORY EXCEPT FOR THOSE ASSIGNED TO MULTILATERAL HEADQUARTERS. AS REGARDS THE EAST'S QUESTION ON PERSONNEL OF THE U.S. DUAL BASED GROUND FORCE UNITS PERMANENTLY STATIONED IN THE AREA, THE PERSONNEL OF THESE UNITS HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS BECAUSE THEY WERE SUBORDINATE TO A CORPS. AS TO THE LAST PART OF THIS QUESTION, REGARDING PERSONNEL OF THE US PERSHING MISSILE BRIGADE, THESE HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 02 OF 10 151151Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
/078 W

-----033946 151155Z /11

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2749
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

7. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT EASTERN REPS HAD ALSO ASKED WHICH TYPES OF AIR DEFENSE UNITS OF BELGIUM, THE FRG, NETHERLANDS, AND THE UK HAD BEEN INCLUDED ON THE BASIS OF UNIFORM IN GROUND FORCES AND WHICH IN AIR FORCES. WESTERN REPS ASSUMED THE QUESTION REFERRED TO PERSONNEL IN GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE UNITS. THE GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE UNITS IN THOSE FOUR COUNTRIES WHOSE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE GROUND FORCE FIGURE BECAUSE THEY WERE ARMY PERSONNEL INCLUDED ALL THOSE AIR DEFENSE UNITS -- WHETHER MISSILE, ARTILLERY, SIGNAL OR SUPPORT -- THAT WERE SUBORDINATE TO CORPS OF WESTERN GROUND FORCES. ANTIAIRCRAFT ARTILLERY UNITS, REGARDLESS OF THEIR SUBORDINATION, ARE ALL IN THE ARMY AND ARE COUNTED IN THE GROUND FORCE FIGURES. THOSE SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE UNITS WHICH ARE NOT SUBORDINATED TO ARMY CORPS ARE IN THE AIR FORCES OF THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNTRIES AND THEIR PERSONNEL HAVE BEEN COUNTED IN OUR FIGURES FOR AIR FORCE MANPOWER.

8. BELGIAN REP STATED THAT AS REGARDS PERSONNEL OF SUPPORT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 02 OF 10 151151Z

UNITS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN

UNITS WHICH SUPPORTED MORE THAN ONE BRANCH OF SERVICE, THOSE PERSONNEL WHO WERE ARMY PERSONNEL HAD BEEN COUNTED AS GROUND FORCES MANPOWER, AND THOSE WHO WERE AIR FORCE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN COUNTED AS AIR MANPOWER. THE PERSONNEL OF THESE SUPPORT UNITS COUNTED AS GROUND FORCE MANPOWER HAD BEEN FURTHER SUBDIVIDED BETWEEN THE TWO CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO SUBORDINATION. THAT IS, GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL IN UNITS SUBORDINATE TO THE CORPS OF WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS. ALL OTHERS HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY. SIMILARLY, AIR FORCE PERSONNEL IN UNITS OF THIS TYPE WHICH WERE SUBORDINATE TO WESTERN TACTICAL AIR COMMANDS OR TACTICAL AIR FORCES HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS, AND ALL OTHERS HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

9. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT FINALLY, EASTERN REPS HAD ALSO ASKED IF THERE WERE ANY TYPES OF FORMATIONS IN THE GROUND FORCES OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WHICH WERE EQUIVALENT TO DIVISIONS. THE ANSWER WAS THAT, USING WESTERN MILITARY TERMINOLOGY AND CONCEPTS, THERE WERE NO UNITS IN WESTERN GROUND FORCES IN THE AREA WHICH WERE REFERRED TO IN THE WEST AS QUOTE EQUIVALENT TO DIVISIONS UNQUOTE. IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT EASTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT IN THE ARMED FORCES OF WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES, THIS TERM QUOTE FORMATIONS EQUIVALENT TO DIVISIONS UNQUOTE REFERRED TO BRIGADES, WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT WESTERN GROUND FORCES IN THE AREA INCLUDED FORMATIONS WHICH WERE CALLED BRIGADES. THOSE BRIGADES, WHICH ARE SUBORDINATE TO CORPS INCLUDING OF COURSE BRIGADES WITHIN DIVISIONS, HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS. THOSE NOT SUBORDINATE TO CORPS HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

10. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, BELGIAN REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME ADDITIONAL
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 02 OF 10 151151Z

QUESTIONS TO CLARIFY THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF EASTERN FIGURES. FIRST, IN THE LAST MEETING ON APRIL 12, AMB TARASOV HAD SAID THAT, IN THE ALLOCATION OF GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL OF THE GDR, POLAND, AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA BETWEEN THE TWO CATEGORIES, THE PERSONNEL OF DIVISIONS HAD BEEN INCLUDED, REGARDLESS OF THEIR SUBORDINATION, IN THE FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS.

11. WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER DIVISIONS WERE THE ONLY UNITS NOT SUBORDINATED TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF A MILITARY DISTRICT WHOSE PERSONNEL THE EAST HAD COUNTED UNDER ITS FIGURES FOR PERSONNEL IN MAJOR FORMATIONS OF THE GDR, POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA?

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 03 OF 10 151202Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
/078 W

-----034271 151212Z /11

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2750
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

12. BELGIAN REP STATED THAT SECOND, AMB TARASOV HAD ALSO SAID IN ANSWER TO THE WESTERN QUESTION ON PERSONNEL OF POLISH UNITS OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE THAT SUCH PERSONNEL WERE CALLED UPON TO SERVE QUOTE PERIODICALLY UNQUOTE IN THE UNITS FOR TERRITORIAL DEFENSE. IT WAS THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING FROM THIS THAT THESE PERSONNEL DID NOT PERFORM THEIR ENTIRE PERIOD OF ACTIVE SERVICE IN A SINGLE CONSECUTIVE PERIOD. INSTEAD, AFTER SOME INITIAL PERIOD OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE FOLLOWING CONSCRIPTION, THEY WERE ALLOWED TO RETURN TO THEIR HOMES, AND WERE SUBSEQUENTLY CALLED UP FOR SPECIFIC TIME PERIODS IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH SOME NATIONAL ECONOMIC TASKS, UNTIL THEIR FULL PERIOD OF OBLIGATION WAS COMPLETED. WAS THIS UNDERSTANDING CORRECT? THIRD, WAS IT THE CASE THAT THE ONLY PERSONNEL WHOM THE EAST HAD EXCLUDED FROM ITS FIGURES ON THE GROUNDS THAT THEY WERE IN THE QUOTE POLISH UNITS FOR TERRITORIAL DEFENSE UNQUOTE WERE THOSE POLISH PERSONNEL WHO SERVED ON THIS PART-TIME BASIS?

13. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT FOURTH, AMB TARASOV HAD SAID THAT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 03 OF 10 151202Z

PERSONNEL OF ALL BRIGADES SUBORDINATED TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF SOVIET FORCES IN THE GDR HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS. WESTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD FROM THIS THAT PERSONNEL

OF ALL SOVIET SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILE UNITS HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE FIGURES FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS, REGARDLESS OF THE SUBORDINATION OF THE UNITS. WAS THIS CORRECT? FIFTH, THE WEST WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IN WHICH CATEGORY OF GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL THE EAST HAD COUNTED THE PERSONNEL OF SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE UNITS WHICH WERE SUBORDINATE NEITHER TO DIVISIONS NOR TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF SOVIET ARMIES IN THE GDR?

14. BELGIAN REP STATED THAT SIXTH, DID THE EASTERN FIGURES FOR GROUND FORCE MANPOWER OF THE GDR, POLAND, AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA FOLLOW THE SAME PRACTICE USED AS REGARDS THE PERSONNEL OF BRIGADES IN THE CASE OF SOVIET FIGURES. THAT IS, WERE ALL PERSONNEL OF ALL BRIGADES COUNTED IN THE FIGURES FOR GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL IN MAJOR FORMATIONS OF THOSE COUNTRIES? SEVENTH, IN WHICH CATEGORY HAD THE EAST COUNTED THE PERSONNEL OF THOSE SOVIET UNITS IN THE AREA WHICH WERE DEVOTED MAINLY TO TRAINING NEWLY CONSCRIPTED SOLDIERS? WHAT CRITERION HAD THE EAST USED FOR THIS ALLOCATION?

15. POLISH REP SAID EASTERN REPS WOULD ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING. AT PRESENT, POLISH REP WISHED TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE BELGIAN REP IN THE APRIL 12 SESSION. BELGIAN REP'S FIRST QUESTION HAD BEEN, AS REGARDS THE WAY IN WHICH THE WEST HAD ALLOCATED PERSONNEL BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES, IT WAS THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING FROM WHAT EASTERN REPS HAD SAID PREVIOUSLY THAT ALL OF THE PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE COMMANDS OF POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE EASTERN FIGURE FOR THE AIR MANPOWER OF THESE TWO COUNTRIES. WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE EASTERN REPS TO CONFIRM THIS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 03 OF 10 151202Z

16. POLISH REP SAID HIS ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS YES. EASTERN REPS CONFIRMED THEIR STATEMENT OF JULY 15, 1977 THAT ALL OF THE PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE COMMANDS OF POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA WERE INCLUDED BY EASTERN PARTICIPANTS IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE AIR FORCES OF THESE TWO COUNTRIES.

17. POLISH REP SAID BELGIAN REP'S SECOND QUESTION HAD BEEN THAT IT WAS THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING FROM WHAT AMB TARASOV HAD SAID ON JUNE 28, 1977 THAT THE EAST'S FIGURE FOR AIR MANPOWER INCLUDED PERSONNEL OF HELICOPTER UNITS WHICH SUPPORTED THE AIR FORCES. WOULD EASTERN REPS CONFIRM THIS?

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 04 OF 10 152251Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
/078 W

-----040048 152302Z /62

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2751
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (TEXT, PARA 22)

18. POLISH REP SAID THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS THAT,
ON 28 JUNE 1977, AMB TARASOV HAD STATED THAT A SMALL PART OF
HELICOPTERS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH TABLE OF ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE,
WAS INCLUDED IN AIR FORCES. THIS WAS WHY THE PERSON EL OF THESE
HELICOPTER SUBUNITS WERE COUNTED BY EASTERN PARTICIPANTS IN THE
NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF AIR FORCES. NOW, EASTERN REPS WERE
CONFIRMING THIS.

19. BELGIAN REP ON APRIL 12 HAD ASKED WHETHER THE ONLY GROUND
FORCE PERSONNEL OF THE SOVIET GROUPS OF FORCES IN POLAND AND
CZECHOSLOVAKIA WHOM THE EAST HAD COUNTED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY
WERE PERSONNEL IN SUBUNITS OF BATTALION SIZE OR SMALLER.
WAS THIS CORRECT.

20. POLISH REP SAID THE ANSWER WAS, THAT THIS WAS RIGHT.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 04 OF 10 152251Z

21. POLISH REP SAID THE BELGIAN REP HAD ALSO ASKED ON APRIL 12
A QUESTION AS FOLLOWS, AT THE LAST MEETING, AMB TARASOV HAD
SAID PERSONNEL QUOTE SMALL UNITS AND SUBUNITS UNQUOTE DIRECTLY
SUBORDINATE TO THE COMMAND OF THE GROUP OF SOVIET FORCES IN
THE GDR HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY THE EAST IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

SINCE EASTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT QUOTE SUBUNITS UNQUOTE REFERRED TO UNITS OF BATTALION SIZE OR SMALLER, AND THAT ALL QUOTE DIVISIONS UNQUOTE AND EQUIVALENT UNITS HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN MAJOR FORMATIONS, WESTERN REPS ASSUMED THAT THE TERM QUOTE SMALL UNITS UNQUOTE MEANT UNITS OF BRIGADE OR REGIMENT SIZE. WAS THIS CORRECT?

22. POLISH REP SAID THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS THAT, IN THE EAST'S REPLY TO A QUESTION ASKED BY THE US REP IN THE SESSION OF 16 MARCH, EASTERN REPS HAD POINTED OUT THAT QUOTE PERSONNEL OF ALL DIVISIONS AND EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY EASTERN PARTICIPANTS IN THE CATEGORY OF MAJOR FORMATIONS UNQUOTE. ON APRIL 12, THE BELGIAN REP, REFERRING TO EASTERN ANSWERS, POINTED OUT THAT EASTERN REPS HAD SUPPOSEDLY STATED THAT QUOTE ALL DIVISIONS AND EQUIVALENT UNITS WERE INCLUDED IN MAJOR FORMATIONS UNQUOTE. AS WESTERN REPS MIGHT UNDERSTAND, THIS SECOND POINT DID NOT AT ALL MEAN THE SAME THING. A FORMATION WAS OF A DIFFERENT SIZE THAN AN UNIT, WHICH WAS SMALLER. IN THE EAST'S REPLY OF APRIL 12 EASTERN REPS HAD EXPLAINED THAT QUOTE BY EQUIVALENT FORMATIONS, WE MEAN BRIGADES UNQUOTE. EARLIER, ON APRIL 4, EASTERN REPS HAD EXPLAINED THE TERM QUOTE SUB-UNIT UNQUOTE. WHEN EASTERN REPS USED THE TERM QUOTE SMALL UNITS UNQUOTE, THEY HAD HAD IN MIND ORGANIZATIONS OF BATTALION SIZE.

23. POLISH REP SAID BELGIAN REP HAD ALSO ASKED IN THE ALLOCATION OF SOVIET GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL BETWEEN THE TWO CATEGORIES, WAS THE SOVIET ARTILLERY DIVISION IN THE GDR THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 04 OF 10 152251Z

ONLY EXCEPTION TO THE PRINCIPLE OF SUBORDINATION? THAT IS, WAS THAT ARTILLERY DIVISION THE ONLY SOVIET UNIT, SUB-UNIT, OR FORMATION WHICH WAS NOT SUBORDINATE TO A SOVIET ARMY IN THE GDR OR TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE GROUP OF SOVIET FORCES IN EITHER POLAND OR CZECHOSLOVAKIA BUT WHOSE PERSONNEL THE EAST HAD COUNTED IN THE FIGURE FOR MAJOR FORMATIONS?

24. POLISH REP SAID THE EAST'S ANSWER WAS AS FOLLOWS: YES. THIS WAS THE ONLY DIVISION WHICH WAS NOT SUBORDINATE TO ARMIES BUT DIRECTLY TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE GROUP OF SOVIET FORCES IN THE GDR AND, AS EASTERN REPS HAD ALREADY STATED, THE PERSONNEL OF THIS DIVISION WAS INCLUDED BY THEM IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF MAJOR FORMATIONS. US REP QUESTIONED WHETHER POLISH REP HAD ANSWERED THE SPECIFIC QUESTION WESTERN REPS HAD ASKED. POLISH REP SAID HE HAD.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 05 OF 10 151254Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
ACDE-00 /078 W

-----034662 151302Z /41

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2752
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

25. POLISH REP SAID BELGIAN REP'S SIXTH QUESTION HAD BEEN IN
WHAT CATEGORY HAD THE EAST COUNTED THE SOVIET BRIGADE IN BERLIN?

26. POLISH REP SAID THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS THAT THE
SOVIET BRIGADE STATIONED IN BERLIN WAS A PART OF AN ARMY. THAT
WAS WHY ITS PERSONNEL HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE NUMERICAL
STRENGTH OF MAJOR FORMATIONS.

27. POLISH REP SAID BELGIAN REP'S SEVENTH QUESTION HAD BEEN,
WERE THE PART-TIME PERSONNEL OF THE POLISH UNITS OF TERRITORIAL
DEFENSE ONLY GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL, OR WERE THERE ALSO AIR
PERSONNEL WHO FELL INTO THIS GROUP OF PERSONNEL WHOM THE EAST
HAD EXCLUDED FROM ITS FIGURES.?

28. POLISH REP SAID THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS THAT THE
PART-TIME PERSONNEL OF THE TERRITORIAL DEFENSE UNITS OF POLAND
CONCERNED ONLY GROUND FORCES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 05 OF 10 151254Z

29. FRG REP SAID THAT, IN THE LAST SESSION WHEN HE HAD PRESENTED
THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS, HE HAD SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WOULD
BE PREPARED TO ANSWER POSSIBLE EASTERN QUESTIONS. WESTERN REPS
WERE READY TO DO SO NOW IF EASTERN REPS HAD QUESTIONS.

30. GDR REP SAID HE WOULD PRESENT EASTERN QUESTIONS.

31. GDR REP SAID THE FIRST EASTERN QUESTION WAS: THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE WAS MADE DEPENDENT ON THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN EAST AND WEST REGARDING NUMERICAL DATA ON THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF FORCES. THE WESTERN INITIATIVE HOWEVER PROVIDED ALREADY IN THE FIRST PHASE FOR REDUCTIONS OF AMERICAN AND SOVIET FORCES AMOUNTING TO 68,000 SOVIET PERSONNEL AND 29,000 AMERICAN PERSONNEL. COULD WESTERN REPS EXPLAIN, ON WHAT BASIS HAD THE WEST SELECTED THE ABOVE MENTIONED NUMBERS OF THE STRENGTH OF THE FORCES OF THE USSR AND THE USA TO BE SUBJECT TO REDUCTIONS IN THE FIRST PHASE, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THESE TWO NUMBERS?

32. GDR REP SAID HIS SECOND QUESTION WAS THAT THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE READ THAT ALL ASPECTS OF THE WESTERN PROGRAM NOT MENTIONED IN THE INITIATIVE REMAINED VALID. IN THIS CONNECTION, COULD WESTERN REPS MENTION THE ASPECTS OF THE WESTERN PROPOSALS OF 1973 AND 1975 WHICH REMAINED VALID?

33. GDR REP SAID HIS THIRD QUESTION WAS: DID THE PROPOSAL BY THE WEST ON FREEZING THE STRENGTH OF FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES OTHER THAN THE USSR AND THE USA BETWEEN THE TWO REDUCTION PHASES REMAIN VALID?

34. AT TARASOV'S SUGGESTION, GDR REP SAID HE WOULD PAUSE SO WESTERN REPS COULD REPLY TO THESE QUESTIONS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 05 OF 10 151254Z

35. US REP SAID, AS TO GDR REP'S THIRD QUESTION, THE WESTERN PROPOSAL ON FREEZING THE STRENGTH OF FORCES BETWEEN THE TWO PHASES DID REMAIN VALID AND IT WAS ONE OF THE ASPECTS OF THE WESTERN PROGRAM NOT MENTIONED IN THE INITIATIVE WHICH REMAINED VALID.

36. US REP SAID, AS TO OTHER ASPECTS OF THE WESTERN PROGRAM WHICH REMAINED VALID, HE BELIEVED IT WOULD BE BETTER IF EASTERN REPS WOULD ASK SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. HE WOULD NOT TRY TO ENUMERATE ALL POINTS, BECAUSE HE MIGHT OMIT SOMETHING INADVERTENTLY.

37. US REP SAID, AS TO THE GDR REP'S FIRST QUESTION, THE STRENGTH OF US AND SOVIET UNION REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I, THIS WAS ANOTHER ITEM WHICH REMAINED WITHOUT CHANGE FROM THE EXISTING WESTERN PROGRAM. WESTERN REPS BELIEVED THERE WAS NO INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN THAT CONTINUED DEMAND AND THE ACTUAL FACTS WITH RESPECT TO THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA. THE WEST CONTINUED TO PROPOSE FORCES IN THE

AREA SHOULD BE REDUCED TO A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING SHOULD
BE REDUCED TO A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING AT APPROXIMATELY
700,000 MEN FOR GROUND FORCE MANPOWER.

TARASOV SAID THAT US REP HAD SAID THAT THIS WESTERN POSITION
WAS BASED ON THE FACTUAL RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES, BUT PARTICIPANTS
HAD SOME DEFINITE DIVERGENCES IN THEIR ESTIMATES OF THE FACTUAL
CORRELATION OF FORCES. WAS IT CORRECT TO UNDERSTAND THAT IF,
AS A RESULT OF THE DATA DISCUSSION, A CORRELATION OF FORCES
OTHER THAN THAT FROM WHICH THE WEST WAS NOW PROCEEDING WERE TO
BE ESTABLISHED, THAT, THEN, THE WESTERN DEMAND AS REGARDS
REDUCTION OF 68,000 SOVIET TROOPS AND 29,000 US TROOPS RESPECTIVELY
WOULD CHANGE?

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 06 OF 10 151317Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13
L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15
TRSE-00 /078 W

-----035183 151320Z /50

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2753
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 6 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

38. US REP SAID THAT, AS WESTERN REPS HAD INDICATED, WESTERN
PARTICIPANTS SOUGHT AN AGREEMENT ON DATA. THEY RECOGNIZED THAT
AT PRESENT THERE WERE DIFFERENCES OF VIEWS. SUCH AN AGREEMENT
ON DATA WOULD BY ITS NATURE AFFECT THE SIZE OF MANPOWER REDUCTIONS
NEEDED IN THE SECOND PHASE TO REACH THE SUGGESTED COMMON CEILING.
HOWEVER, WESTERN REPS DID NOT ANTICIPATE THAT IT WOULD AFFECT
THE SIZE OF REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I.

39. POLISH REP ASKED: WHAT ABOUT THE SIZE OF REDUCTIONS IN
THE SECOND PHASE? US REP SAID REDUCTIONS TO THE COMMON CEILING
IN THE SECOND PHASE WOULD DEPEND ON DATA AGREEMENT. TARASOV

SAID THIS WAS NOT THE POINT. WHO CHOSE THESE PARTICULAR FIGURES, 68,000 AND 29,000? US REP SAID THESE FIGURES HAD BEEN PART OF THE WESTERN PROPOSALS SINCE 1973 AND HAD NOT CHANGED. THE REASONS THE WEST HAD GIVEN OVER THE PAST YEARS FOR THESE FIGURES HAD ALSO NOT CHANGED.

40. TARASOV SAID IT WAS UNDERSTANDABLE AND CLEAR WHY WHEN THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 06 OF 10 151317Z

WEST TABLED ITS INITIAL PROPOSALS, IT HAD PROCEEDED AT THAT TIME FROM ITS UNDERSTANDING OF THE DISPARITIES. NOW THAT THE WEST WAS MAKING ITS NEW PROPOSALS CONDITIONAL ON THE RESULTS OF THE DATA DISCUSSION WHICH, AS WAS KNOWN, HAD NOT YET BEEN COMPLETED, WHY WERE THESE PREVIOUS FIGURES STILL CONTAINED IN THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE? EVEN MORE, ONE OF THE CONDITIONS PUT FORTH BY THE WEST IN ITS NEW PROPOSALS WAS ACCEPTANCE OF ITS REDUCTIONS SCHEME IN PHASE 1.

41. FRG REP SAID THAT THE WESTERN POSITION SINCE 1973, AND AT PRESENT, WAS BASED ON THE WESTERN UNDERSTANDING OF THESE DISPARITIES AND THE NEED TO ELIMINATE THEM. THE WESTERN REDUCTIONS CONCEPT HAD FROM THE BEGINNING REQUIRED A DATA AGREEMENT. ON THESE TWO POINTS, THERE WAS NO CHANGE IN THE WESTERN POSITION. THAT IS, WESTERN REPS CONTINUED TO BELIEVE THAT THERE WAS A HUGE DISPARITY IN GROUND FORCE NUMBERS AND THAT DATA AGREEMENT WAS REQUIRED. THESE WERE TWO POINTS WHERE THE WESTERN POSITION HAD NOT CHANGED. WHERE THE WEST WAS CHANGING ITS POSITION WAS AS REGARDS THE MODALITIES OF SOVIET REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I. THE PROPOSAL FOR REDUCTION OF 1700 TANKS AND 68,000 MEN WAS UNCHANGED, BUT NOW INSTEAD OF A TANK ARMY, THE SOVIET UNION WAS ASKED TO REDUCE FIVE DIVISIONS, PLUS THE ADDITIONAL TANKS AND MEN NEEDED TO BRING THEM TO THE REQUIRED TOTALS, AND A LIMITATION ON TANKS RATHER THAN ON OTHER SOVIET WEAPONS.

42. GDR REP SAID THAT THE NEXT EASTERN QUESTION WAS HOW LONG IN THE WESTERN VIEW WAS THE FIRST REDUCTION PHASE GOING TO LAST AS REGARDS ITS IMPLEMENTATION? US REP SAID THERE WAS NO CHANGE IN THE WESTERN POSITION ON THIS TOPIC. AS HE RECOLLECTED, THE WEST HAD MADE THE POINT THAT IF PARTICIPANTS WOULD PROCEED PROMPTLY.

THIS POINT WOULD BE AGREED IN ANY CASE. US REP SAID HE WOULD
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 06 OF 10 151317Z

REVIEW THE WESTERN POSITION ON THIS TOPIC AND SUPPLEMENT HIS
REPLY IF NECESSARY.

43. GDR REP SAID HIS FIFTH QUESTION WAS, WAS IT A CORRECT UNDERSTANDING THAT PHASE II REDUCTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FIRST AND SECOND ALTERNATIVES OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL HAD TO BE CONCLUDED WITHIN THE TWO TO THREE YEARS AT THE LATEST AFTER THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PHASE I AGREEMENT?

44. US REP SAID THIS WAS AN ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE. THE WEST MEANT THAT THE ENTIRE PROCESS OF REDUCTIONS TO THE COMMON CEILING SHOULD BE CONCLUDED BY THEN. GDR REP ASKED, WAS IT THE WESTERN PROPOSAL TO AGREE ON THE SPECIFIC FIGURE OF THREE YEARS? US REP SAID THE TIME PERIODS GIVEN WERE ILLUSTRATIVE BUT WERE ALSO ACCEPTABLE TO THE WEST. SHUSTOV ASKED WHETHER THE TOTAL TIME FOR EACH OF THE TWO ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE THREE YEARS. US REP SAID YES.

GDR REP SAID HIS SIXTH QUESTION WAS, HAD ANY PROVISION BEEN MADE FOR THE STIPULATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION BY EACH DIRECT PARTICIPANT STATE OTHER THAN THE US AND THE USSR TO THE FORCE REDUCTIONS PRIOR TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING?

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 07 OF 10 151328Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
ACDE-00 /078 W

-----035296 151336Z /41

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2754
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 7 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

45. WESTERN REPS ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE QUESTION.
TARASOV SAID THE QUESTION MEANT, DID THE WESTERN INITIATIVE

ENVISAGE IN ANY FORM DEFINING INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF EACH
DIRECT PARTICIPANT STATE OTHER THAN US AND THE USSR IN THE
FORCE REDUCTIONS TO EACH THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING?
HOW MANY PERSONNEL WOULD BE REDUCED BY EACH DIRECT PARTICIPANT?

46. US REP SAID THAT BOTH ALTERNATIVES PROVIDED FOR COLLECTIVE
REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. THE CONCEPT OF A COLLECTIVE REDUCTION
COMMITMENT WAS CONSISTENT WITH THE WESTERN CONCEPT OF COLLECTIVE
MANPOWER LIMITATIONS AND WITH THE WESTERN OPPOSITION TO
NATIONAL CEILINGS. ALL WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS
AND CANADA WOULD PARTICIPATE IN THE PHASE II REDUCTIONS. WHAT
SHOULD BE OF INTEREST TO EASTERN POLITICAL AND MILITARY LEADERS
WAS THAT THE WESTERN FORCES FACING THEM IN THE REDUCTION AREA
WOULD BE REDUCED BY A CERTAIN SPECIFIED AMOUNT AT A CERTAIN
SPECIFIED TIME AND THAT THEY WOULD NOT EXCEED THE AGREED
RESIDUAL LEVEL. FINALLY, IT WAS THE WESTERN POSITION THAT THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 07 OF 10 151328Z

INTERNAL COMPOSITION OF WESTERN EUROPEAN AND CANADA REDUCTIONS
WAS NOT A MATTER FOR EAST/WEST NEGOTIATION.

47. POLISH REP ASKED, WOULD THERE BE ANY WAY FOR EASTERN REPS
TO KNOW WHO REDUCED HOW MUCH OF THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS OTHER
THAN THE US AND THE USSR. SHUSTOV ADDED, AND TO KNOW WHAT KIND
OF UNITS WOULD BE REDUCED?

48. FRG REP SAID THIS WAS A QUESTION OF VERIFICATION.
PARTICIPANTS HAD NOT YET DISCUSSED THIS TOPIC. BUT THEY WOULD
PROBABLY HAVE TO AGREE ON EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AS PART OF THE
PROCESS OF VERIFYING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PHASE II REDUCTION
AGREEMENT. BUT THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE DEFENSE BURDEN WITHIN
THE INTEGRATED STRUCTURE OF NATO COULD NOT BE THE SUBJECT
OF EAST/WEST AGREEMENT OR EAST/WEST NEGOTIATION.

49. TARASOV SAID THE US REP IN ANSWERING THE EAST'S QUESTION
HAD MENTIONED NATIONAL CEILINGS. THE FRG REP HAD JUST SPOKEN
OF VERIFICATION. BUT NEITHER OF THESE POINTS COULD BE CONSIDERED
AS AN ANSWER TO THE EAST'S QUESTION. THE EAST HAD NOT ASKED
ABOUT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CEILINGS, EITHER NATIONAL OR
COLLECTIVE, BUT ABOUT INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS WHICH EACH
STATE WOULD MAKE TO REDUCTIONS, AND HE WISHED TO EMPHASIZE,
TO REDUCTIONS. AS FAR AS THE FRG REP'S ANSWER WAS CONCERNED,
IT WAS NOT CLEAR FOR EASTERN REPS HOW IT COULD BE POSSIBLE TO
REPLY TO THE QUESTION WHICH THE EAST HAD RAISED WITH ANOTHER
QUESTION ON VERIFICATION. IN ORDER TO VERIFY IT WAS NECESSARY
TO KNOW WHO AND WHAT WAS REDUCED. OTHERWISE, VERIFICATION WOULD
BE SENSELESS.

50. FRG REP SAID HE BELIEVED US REP AND HE HAD ANSWERED THESE
QUESTIONS. IT WAS WELL KNOWN THAT THE WEST COULD NOT ACCEPT

NATIONAL CEILINGS IN ANY FORM WHETHER DE JURE OR DE FACTO WHICH
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 07 OF 10 151328Z

COULD BE CONSTRUED OUT OF NATIONAL REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. US
REP HAD MADE CLEAR THAT THE PROPOSED COMMITMENT WAS VALID FOR
ALL WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA. THE QUESTION
OF VERIFICATION WAS ACTUALLY A QUESTION WHICH REMAINED TO BE
DISCUSSED AND THIS WAS A QUESTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF AN ALREADY
CONCLUDED AGREEMENT.

51. GDR REP SAID HIS SEVENTH QUESTION WAS, AS REGARDS THE
REDUCTION OF THE FORCES OF THE USSR AND THE USA, THE WESTERN
PROPOSAL PROVIDED FOR AN EXCHANGE OF LISTS CONTAINING THE UNITS
TO BE REDUCED. WOULD SUCH AN EXCHANGE OF LISTS TAKE PLACE ALSO
AS REGARDS THE REDUCTION OF THE FORCES OF THE REMAINING
DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE SECOND PHASE?

52. US REP REPLIED THIS WAS A MATTER FOR PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS
BECAUSE IT WAS AN ISSUE WHICH BELONGED TO THE MODALITIES OF
PHASE II REDUCTIONS AND SHOULD BE DISCUSSED IN PHASE II. FRG
REP SAID THIS POINT ALSO APPLIED TO VERIFICATION OF PHASE II
REDUCTIONS WHICH ALSO WAS A MATTER FOR DISCUSSION IN PHASE II.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 08 OF 10 151353Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13
L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15
TRSE-00 /078 W

-----035527 151356Z /50

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2755
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 8 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

53. GDR REP ASKED, DID THE WEST CONTINUE TO ADHERE TO ITS POSITION AS REGARDS THE QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING NATIONAL CEILINGS FOR THE FORCES OF THE USSR AND THE USA?

54. US REP SAID THE WESTERN PROPOSAL THAT THERE SHOULD BE SPECIFIC LIMITATION ON US AND SOVIET MANPOWER REMAINED UNCHANGED. THESE LIMITS OF COURSE WERE NOT NATIONAL CEILINGS, BUT MERELY LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER OF MEN WHO COULD BE STATIONED BY THESE PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS.

55. GDR REP SAID HIS NINTH QUESTION WAS, DID THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE EAST'S CRITICISM OF THE WESTERN CONCEPT OF COLLECTIVE CEILINGS TO THE EFFECT THAT THIS CONCEPT WOULD ENABLE INDIVIDUAL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN USSR AND THE USA IN FUTURE EVEN TO INCREASE THE NUMERICAL LEVEL OF THEIR FORCES AS COMPARED TO THE PRESENT LEVEL? AND IF IT DID DO SO, IN WHAT WAY?

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 08 OF 10 151353Z

56. US REP SAID THERE WAS NO CHANGE IN THE WESTERN CONCEPT OF THE OPERATIONS OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING AND HE WOULD REFER TO HIS PREVIOUS REMARK THAT IT SHOULD BE OF INTEREST TO THE EAST THAT WESTERN FORCES FACING THEM IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS WOULD BE REDUCED BY A SPECIFIC AMOUNT BY A SPECIFIC TIME AND WOULD NOT EXCEED THE RESIDUAL LEVEL.

57. GDR REP ASKED, WHEN WOULD NEGOTIATIONS ON THE SECOND PHASE OF REDUCTIONS START IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSAL AND WHEN WOULD THEY BE CONCLUDED?

58. US REP SAID THE POINT AT WHICH THESE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD START WOULD BE FIXED IN A PHASE I AGREEMENT. WESTERN REPS DID NOT ANTICIPATE DIFFICULTY IN REACHING AGREEMENT ON THIS SUBJECT. AS A PRACTICAL MATTER, PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD BE COMPLETED IN TIME TO IMPLEMENT THE REDUCTIONS WITHIN THE PERIODS OF TIME SPECIFIED IN A PHASE I AGREEMENT. IN OTHER WORDS, THEY SHOULD BE CONCLUDED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

59. GDR REP ASKED WHAT DID THE WEST MEAN BY SAYING IN THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSAL, THAT, IF PHSE II NEGOTIATIONS DID NOT RESULT IN TIMELY AGREEMENT, EACH SIDE WOULD NEVERTHELESS IMPLEMENT THOSE PHASE II REDUCTIONS SPECIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH A PHASE I AGREEMENT? WERE THESE TO BE UNILATERAL ACTIONS OF THE STATES, OR WAS THIS TO BE THE RESULT OF SOME AGREEMENT?

60. US REP SAID THE WESTERN INTENTION IN INCLUDING THIS PROVISION

IN THE WESTERN PROPOSALS WAS TO OFFER EASTERN PARTICIPANTS A
FIRM COMMITMENT IN PHASE I REGARDING THE OVERALL AMOUNT AND
TIMING OF MANPOWER REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PHASE II BY THE
WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA. IT WAS THE
WESTERN VIEW THAT, WITH A SUCCESSFUL PHASE I AGREEMENT
BEHIND THEM, IT WOULD BE IN THE INTERESTS OF ALL PARTICIPANTS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 08 OF 10 151353Z

TO ACHIEVE AGREEMENT IN PHASE II ALSO. HOWEVER, IT MIGHT BECOME
CLEAR AT SOME POINT IN TIME AFTER THE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS
WERE UNDERWAY THAT IT MIGHT NOT BE POSSIBLE TO REACH AGREEMENT
ON ALL ISSUES OF A PHASE II AGREEMENT BEFORE THE TIME LIMITS
AGREED IN PHASE I FOR PHASE II REDUCTIONS HAD BEEN REACHED.
IN THAT EVENT, PARTICIPANTS WOULD CARRY OUT THEIR PHASE II
REDUCTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THOSE POINTS ON WHICH DEFINITE
AGREEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED BY THAT TIME. AS REGARDS POINTS ON
WHICH THERE HAD BEEN NO AGREEMENT, IT WOULD BE UP TO PARTICIPANTS
TO ACT AS THEY DEEMED FIT, OF COURSE IN CONFORMITY WITH OBLIGATIONS
UNDERTAKEN IN PHASE I.

61. TARASOV SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME FURTHER QUESTIONS.
THE FIRST OF THESE WAS, WHAT DID THE WEST MEAN BY SAYING THAT
OTHER TOPICS COULD BE RAISED IN STAGE 2 OTHER THAN THE MODALITIES
OF THE PHASE II REDUCTIONS?

62. US REP SAID WESTERN PARTICIPANTS DID NOT HAVE ANY SPECIFIC
PROPOSALS AT PRESENT BUT THEY THOUGHT IT WAS IN THE INTERESTS
OF BOTH SIDES TO LEAVE THE WAY OPEN TO INTRODUCE NEW PROPOSALS
AND CONCEPTS INTO PHASE II IF THEY SO DESIRED. THESE, OF COURSE,
WOULD NOT LIMIT THE COMMITMENTS UNDERTAKEN IN CONNECTION
WITH PHASE I AGREEMENT.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 09 OF 10 151400Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
ACDE-00 /078 W
-----035649 151404Z /41

O R 151044Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2756
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 9 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

63. TARASOV ASKED DID THIS MEAN THAT THESE OTHER TOPICS COULD INCLUDE QUESTIONS WHICH WERE OUTSIDE THE FRAMEWORK OF THOSE QUESTIONS AGREED IN THE PRELIMINARY TALKS AND WHICH WERE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE PRESENT NEGOTIATIONS?

64. US REP SAID HE ASSUMED THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THE AGREED COMMUNIQUE WOULD BE APPLICABLE TO PHASE II UNLESS OTHERWISE AGREED.

65. TARASOV SAID, WAS IT CORRECT TO ASSUME THAT THE OTHER TOPICS THAT COULD BE DISCUSSED IN PHASE II WOULD INCLUDE IN PARTICULAR TOPICS OF ARMAMENTS AND AIR FORCE MANPOWER REDUCTIONS?

66. US REP SAID THESE TOPICS WOULD NOT BE PRECLUDED FROM THE SUBJECT MATTER IF ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER WANTED TO RAISE THEM. FRG REP SAID THESE ISSUES OF ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS AND AIR FORCE MANPOWER REDUCTIONS WERE ISSUES ON WHICH IT WAS NOT THE PURPOSE OF THE INITIATIVE TO CHANGE THE WESTERN POSITION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 09 OF 10 151400Z

67. TARASOV SAID THE NEW WESTERN INITIATIVE PROVIDED FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF FIVE SOVIET DIVISIONS. EASTERN REPS WISHED TO KNOW WHETHER THE WEST HAD IN MIND SOME SPECIFIC TYPES OF DIVISIONS OR DIVISIONS ASSIGNED TO SPECIFIC GROUPS OF FORCES, OR WAS IT UP TO THE SOVIET SIDE TO SELECT THESE DIVISIONS?

68. US REP SAID IT WOULD BE UP TO THE SOVIET UNION TO SELECT THESE DIVISIONS.

69. TARASOV ASKED WHAT TYPE OF UNITS AND SUBUNITS AND OF WHAT SIZE WAS THE US PARTICIPANT TO REDUCE AND WERE THEY EXPECTED TO BE WITHDRAWN TO THE TERRITORY OF THE US?

70. US REP SAID THAT, IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT WESTERN PROPOSALS FOR US WITHDRAWALS, THE TERM QUOTE UNIT UNQUOTE COULD MEAN MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS REGIMENTS OR BATTALIONS. IN THE PRESENT CONTEXT, THE TERM QUOTE SUBUNIT UNQUOTE COULD BE

COMPANIES OR PLATOONS. THE US HAD NOT YET DETERMINED ON A SPECIFIC COMPOSITION OF PHASE I US WITHDRAWALS OR ON THE UNITS OR SUBUNITS WHICH WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THESE WITHDRAWALS. HOWEVER, THE UNITS AND SUBUNITS TO BE WITHDRAWN WOULD BE SPECIFIED ON THE LISTS TO BE EXCHANGED PRIOR TO SIGNATURE OF A PHASE I AGREEMENT AND THEY WOULD BE WITHDRAWN TO THE UNITED STATES.

71. TARASOV SAID THE STRENGTH OF SOVIET MILITARY PERSONNEL TO BE WITHDRAWN FROM THE REDUCTION AREA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WESTERN PROPOSAL WAS NOT EQUAL TO THE TOTAL STRENGTH OF MANPOWER OF FIVE SOVIET DIVISIONS. UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, HOW WOULD THE USSR, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS, PICK UP THE NECESSARY NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL WHICH THE WEST PROPOSED IT SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM CENTRAL EUROPE? A SIMILAR
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 09 OF 10 151400Z

QUESTION AROSE AS REGARDS THE NUMBER OF TANKS TO BE WITHDRAWN.

72. US REP SAID THE WESTERN PROPOSAL WAS THAT THE SOVIET UNION SHOULD WITHDRAW FIVE DIVISIONS INCLUDING THEIR MAIN BATTLE TANKS AND TO ADD TO THIS NUMBER OF TANKS THE NECESSARY MAIN BATTLE TANKS TO MAKE UP THE TOTAL OF 1700. IF THE TOTAL MANPOWER IN THE FIVE WITHDRAWN SOVIET DIVISIONS WAS LESS THAN 68,000 MEN, WESTERN PARTICIPANT WOULD EXPECT WITHDRAWAL OF ADDITIONAL SOVIET UNITS WHOSE COMBINED MANPOWER WOULD BRING TOTAL SOVIET WITHDRAWALS TO 68,000 MEN.

73. TARASOV SAID THIS MEANT THAT THE WAY TO DEFINE THE AMOUNT OF MANPOWER AND THE NUMBER OF TANKS IN EXCESS OF THE NUMERICAL MANPOWER STRENGTH OF FIVE SOVIET DIVISIONS AND OF THE NUMBER OF TANKS AVAILABLE TO THEM WOULD BE RESOLVED BY THE SOVIETS. THAT IS TO SAY, IT WOULD BE UP TO THE SOVIETS TO SELECT NUMBERS OF SOVIET PERSONNEL AND TANKS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00220 10 OF 10 151414Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13

L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 /078 W

-----035819 151423Z /50

O R 151044Z APR 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2757

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION USNATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 10 OF 10 MBFR VIENNA 0220

74. US REP SAID THE ANSWER WAS THAT THE SOVIET UNION WOULD MAKE THE SELECTION OF THE ADDITIONAL UNITS AND TANKS.

75. TARASOV ASKED WHETHER THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS PROVIDED FOR ANY ASSOCIATED MEASURES OTHER THAN THOSE WHICH HAD BEEN MENTIONED BY THE WEST EARLIER? IF SO, WHICH?

76. US REP SAID, AT THIS TIME, WEST HAD NOT PROPOSED SPECIFIC OTHER MEASURES BEYOND THOSE WHICH IT HAD TABLED. BUT, AS WESTERN REPS HAD SAID IN THEIR NEW PROPOSALS, THE WEST WOULD ADDRESS THIS SUBJECT IN THE COURSE OF PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS. WESTERN REPS HAD ALREADY IN PAST SAID THAT THEY WOULD HAVE SOME FURTHER SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS TO MAKE AND AS THEY HAD SAID THEY WOULD ADDRESS THIS SUBJECT AS A MATTER TO BE AGREED IN PHASE I.

77. TARASOV SAID, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSAL, ASSOCIATED MEASURES SHOULD BE AGREED ON IN PHASE I. DID THIS MEAN THAT SUCH ASSOCIATED MEASURES WOULD BE EXTENDED TO AN EQUAL
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00220 10 OF 10 151414Z

DEGREE TO THE FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS BOTH IN PHASE I AND PHASE II?

78. US REP SAID WESTERN REPS DID NOT HAVE ANYTHING ADDITIONAL TO ADD ON THIS POINT AT THIS TIME.

79. TARASOV ASKED, WHICH OF THE TWO PHASE II REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES DID THE WEST CONSIDER AS THE PREFERABLE?

80. US REP SAID WEST WAS WILLING TO ACCEPT EITHER. IT WAS UP TO EAST TO SELECT BETWEEN THE TWO.

81. TARASOV SAID EASTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD THIS AND WEST HAD EXPLAINED THIS ALREADY. HOWEVER, FOR THE BENEFIT OF SUBSEQUENT WORK, EASTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHICH ALTERNATIVE WAS

THE MORE PRACTICAL FOR THE WEST.

82. FRG REP SAID THIS WAS A CHOICE OFFERED TO THE EAST. THE WEST HAD NO PREFERENCE. ONE WAS A NEW CONCEPT AND THE OTHER MORE TRADITIONAL BUT IT WAS UP TO THE EAST TO MAKE ITS OWN CHOICE.

83. TARASOV ASKED, WAS IT THE CORRECT UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PERSONNEL OF THE PERSHING MISSILES AND F-4S INCLUDED IN THE US FORCES TO BE REDUCED WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE TWO-THIRDS OF US FORCES TO BE REDUCED IN UNITS AND SUBUNITS?

84. US REP SAID THE US HAD NOT YET DETERMINED THE UNITS AND SUBUNITS TO BE WITHDRAWN. BUT THE WESTERN PROPOSAL TO WITHDRAW THESE SPECIFIC ARMAMENTS STILL STOOD.

85. TARASOV SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A SIDE REMARK: EASTERN REPS FOUND IT SOMEWHAT STRANGE THAT THE US HAD NOT YET
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00220 10 OF 10 151414Z

DETERMINED WHAT UNITS AND SUBUNITS IT WOULD WITHDRAW WHILE IT HAD AT THE SAME TIME DETERMINED THE SPECIFIC TYPES OF UNITS THE USSR SHOULD WITHDRAW AND THEIR NUMBER.

86. TARASOV CONTINUED THAT IT WAS CLEAR FROM SECTION 2.6D OF THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSAL THAT IN THE CASE OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE USSR, LIMITATIONS WOULD BE IMPOSED ON THE MANPOWER OF BOTH GROUND AND AIR FORCES. DID THE WEST MEAN TO EXTEND THE SAME LIMITATIONS TO THE US ARMED FORCES STATIONED IN CENTRAL EUROPE.

87. US REP SAID YES, THE SAME AS FOR THE USSR.

88. TARASOV SAID HIS LAST QUESTION WAS, WOULD THE FORCES OF ANY WESTERN STATES OTHER THAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS STATIONED IN THE REDUCTION AREA BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEW PROPOSAL WHEN DEFINING THE AMOUNTS OF REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS WITHIN THE COLLECTIVE CEILING ESTABLISHED FOR THE WESTERN COUNTRIES?

89. US REP SAID THIS WAS ANOTHER INSTANCE IN WHICH THE WESTERN PROGRAM REMAINED UNCHANGED. HE REFERRED TO HIS REMARK EARLIER IN THE SESSION THAT WESTERN FORCES WOULD NOT EXCEED THE AGREED CEILING.

90. THE SESSION WAS CONCLUDED. IT WAS AGREED TO HOLD THE NEXT SESSION, THE LAST OF THE PRESENT ROUND, ON THE 18TH OF APRIL. THE EAST WILL BE HOST. END TEXT.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: TEXT, DISARMAMENT, MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 15 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978MBFRV00220
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780162-0664
Format: TEL
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780452/aaaabsiv.tel
Line Count: 1140
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 191428ad-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 21
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 78 STATE 96686
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2956305
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS OF APRIL 14, 1978
TAGS: PARM, XH, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/191428ad-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014